



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

real reason of our rule-of-thumb modes of thought, our low standards of public service and our superficial education. Our national storm and stress are yet to come. They will not have been wholly useless, when they have come and gone, if they leave us with an improved sense of human values. Men differ most in mind—their evolved specialty—just as horses in speed or dogs in scent, and our Declaration of Independence is no charter of intellectual equality. We in the business of teaching know this, better than any one else, yet our educational practice often belies our knowledge. Real democracy develops each man according to his real usefulness, and utilizes him according to the same standards. Failure to distinguish here is fatal, and brings upon nations their Cleons and their Clodiuses.

Lest I be misunderstood here, let me hasten to say that I believe every teacher ought to be a minister of enlightenment to all the students before whom Providence has set him. If it is not our mission to bring light and life, we have no mission; but surely we may endeavor to shed that light where as little of it as possible will be wasted. If the Higher Schools of this country are ever to lead its thought more fully than they do now, they must first be true to themselves and their own standards. It is really time for our Colleges to cease conferring learned degrees on philanthropic millionaires and adroit politicians, and for all of us engaged in cosmopolitan education to disregard ancient prejudices and modern catch-words alike, and measure our success by something beyond financial recognition and popular applause. Since when has the demos in the agora been a competent judge of any professional question? If we were more professional, we should know how to insist on our rights.

Before bringing this paper to a close, I feel bound to mention two other matters, both relatively small, but practically important. One of these is the punctuation of texts intended for use in American schools. Notes to-day are multiplied, even as in diplomacy, but children are still left to flounder in a sea of principles. The other matter is the use of much unidiomatic Latin in first-year books and the presence in composition exercises of English phrases that bid defiance to Latin usage. One of the best of recent books contains the phrase "our brave troops". Is it Latin? No, but they talk that way in the country, where our Aegon lives. 'Caesar's men' is a favorite iniquity in some books. I have heard of arithmetics and algebras whose authors delegated to their own students the making of the answer-books. Can it be that the learned and kindly gentlemen who write exercises for Latin books sometimes fail to turn into Latin their own sentences before publishing their books? Frankly, if six hundred years's study of classical models has availed aught, our sentences should not be such as would have excited the derision of a Roman schoolboy by their outrageous Latin, suggestive of the delicious English contained in letters of a Japanese schoolboy,

or of the Greek of the Roman ambassadors to Tarentum. The present crop of first-year Latin books is not altogether creditable to our national scholarship.

In conclusion, let me express the hope that my views may be judged as those of one who has returned to his native land after years of wandering, whose expressions are not to be deemed unfriendly because they are critical. For my part, I would as soon preach vegetarianism in the grocery business, or the opposite doctrine in the meat business, as present extravagant claims for the subject I teach. While such arguments may sometimes have personal justification, they are at all events not professional.

SOUTHERN HIGH SCHOOL,  
Philadelphia.

THOMAS S. COLE.

## REVIEWS

The Olynthiac Speeches of Demosthenes. Edited by J. M. Macgregor. Cambridge: at the University Press (1915). Pp. lii + 101. 65 cents.

This edition contains, besides the text, an extended Introduction and (including two Appendices) some sixty-five pages of Commentary. It is intended mainly for undergraduates of English Universities, and is an attractive and serviceable edition. The Olynthiac Speeches deserve to be much more widely read, and Mr. Macgregor's book is calculated to promote this end.

In the management of the text, however, which is based on that of Blass, the editor leaves something to be desired. The point is that he has undertaken a revision of Blass's text without thinking it worth while to inform us of the changes he has made in the process. It happens that these changes are not small in number or unimportant; indeed, a comparison of the two texts shows that Mr. Macgregor has considerably more than a hundred readings in which he differs from Blass. This is a fact which should not be passed over in silence unless it be desired to obscure the editor's relation to his predecessor.

It would not be fair, however, to say that Mr. Macgregor has left us wholly in the dark in this respect. As points of divergence from Blass he mentions his closer adherence to the MSS, and the fact that he at stairs from 'prodelision', crasis, and elisions and transpositions designed to remove hiatus. The latter statement does not take us far, the matter being of no great importance and the cases infrequent—not more than a dozen in all. Moreover, it is not a divergence in principle, as may be seen in the case of elision to remove hiatus. Here I have noted twenty-two cases where the editor is free to exercise his judgment. In all of these Mr. Macgregor refrains from elision, Blass, in all but three, the reasons in both cases being chiefly pauses in the sense. Out of eleven opportunities for crasis Mr. Macgregor refrains in seven, and likewise he uses transposition but sparingly. In these minor matters, then, there is essentially no great difference in the practice of the two editors.

Of much greater significance is Mr. Macgregor's treatment of suspected interpolations. It is well known to students of Demosthenes that Blass regarded interpolation as the greatest source of corruption in the MSS tradition, and how frequently he thought it occurred is attested by his imposing Index. It is not surprising, then, that in the three Olynthiac Speeches he should bracket forty-two places. These are suspected for a variety of reasons, such as making poor sense, being omitted in certain MSS, or not being found in quotations of later writers. On the other hand Mr. Macgregor, adhering to the MSS and deprecating the testimony of later writers, removes the brackets from all but five of the suspected passages (1.15; 2.7, 8, 28; 3.30). This constitutes his greatest single departure from Blass and illustrates well his adherence to the sounder (and easier) principle.

There is no space to speak further of Mr. Macgregor's changes, but a word must be said regarding the relation of his text to that of Butcher in the Oxford Classical Text Series. To be able to speak concretely I have made a detailed (but not necessarily an exhaustive) comparison, and find that, in 128 cases where Mr. Macgregor differs from Butcher, he agrees with Butcher in 100, and disagrees with him in 28. In 20 of the 28 instances the disagreement with Butcher arises from the latter's agreement with Blass. Mr. Macgregor thus departs from Blass somewhat more frequently than does Butcher, but his standpoint would seem to be virtually the same as that of Butcher, and the question arises whether the real basis of his work is not the Oxford text.

With reference to the Commentary the editor expresses his main obligations to Weil, Sandys, Heslop, and Abbott and Matheson. The notes, which are quite obviously planned, not to give an impression of the author's learning, but to be of use to the student, are brief and clear-cut, and, though they lack the personal touch one feels in the older work of Heslop, they serve their purpose well. In subject-matter they deal for the most part with points of grammar and with difficulties in the way of interpretation, giving considerable assistance (though I think not too much) by means of translations. Little attention is devoted to matters of style.

It is not to be expected that the author's explanations will be regarded in every case as altogether satisfactory. As a minor point of this kind one might cite *ταῦτα δ' ὑμεῖς... λαμβάνετε* in 1.19 referring to the use of the Theoric Fund for festivals. The editor (who is apparently interested in the personal pronouns) comments on *ὑμεῖς* as follows: "Observe the insertion of the pronoun; 'This money *you* receive in such a way as you desire'". Passing over the misleading translation of *λαμβάνετε*, we may say that the note is of no assistance. And yet the insertion of *ὑμεῖς* is in need of explanation. Its purpose can hardly be to contrast the action of the Athenians with that of some other people. The fact seems to be that the

emphasis of the Greek personal pronoun does not always depend on contrast expressed or implied, but is sometimes merely a more vivid consciousness of the person or persons whom the mind of the speaker is contemplating. Again, in 2.23, where *αὐτόν* is found in the indefinite sense of 'a man', it is not necessary to regard it as "agreeing with the understood subject *τινός*". A severer test of the editor's judgment is the well known crux in 1.3 relating to Philip's machinations at Olynthus: *ὡς ἔστι μάλιστα τοῦτο δέος, μή, . . . τρέψῃται καὶ παρασπᾶσθαι τι τῶν δλων πραγμάτων*. Mr. Macgregor attacks the difficulty, (1) by suggesting a somewhat violent emendation, (2) by taking the last words of the sentence in the sense of "our highest interests", and (3) by seeing in the whole passage a medical metaphor—"may bring about strain and rupture in some point of supreme importance". In all these points he seems to me to be in the wrong and to be making hard work of what may be after all a comparatively simple matter. Demosthenes fears that Philip will complicate matters at Olynthus, or, as he expresses it, that 'he will somewhat twist and distort the general situation to his own advantage'.

There is no room to speak of the Introduction of 44 pages, which gives an account of Demosthenes's career, and enables the student to see the relation of the Olynthiac episode to what precedes and follows. The idea is an excellent one and seems to have been admirably carried out.

It is an accident that this book should appear in time of the Great War, but one could hardly think of more appropriate reading than these wise and patriotic speeches.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

JEFFERSON ELMORE.

The Need for Art in Life: A Lecture delivered at the University of Manchester. By I. B. Stoughton Holborn. New York: G. Arnold Shaw (1915). Pp. 116. 75 cents.

The Greek Spirit. By Kate Stephens. New York: Sturgis and Walton Company (1914). Pp. iv + 332. \$1.50.

The contention that beauty in life is a factor of extraordinary importance is sound and rests upon a profound and true philosophy. And that our present pleasure-seeking, sensation-loving, materialistic age would receive immense benefit from the cultivation of a genuine love of the beautiful is not to be gainsaid. But the full thesis of *The Need for Art in Life* (page 15), that

the *main*<sup>1</sup> cause of the social evils of today is a want of art-appreciation,—and that we shall never get true social reform and never conquer the evils of our times until a national love of beauty has been brought about

gives one pause. The proof of this thesis is not sought in an analysis of the nature of beauty as such, although this is dwelt upon at some length (16 ff., 109 ff.),

<sup>1</sup>The italics are mine. The idea contained in this quotation Mr. Holborn sets forth three times.